



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,718	11/30/2001	Won Uk Yu	P-0303	3711
34610	7590	03/27/2006	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			CHANKONG, DOHM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,718

Applicant(s)

YU, WON UK

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination. Claim 1 is amended. Claim 17 is cancelled. Claim 24 is added. Claims 1-16 and 18-24 are presented for further examination.

2> This is a non-final rejection.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3> A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12.28.2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4> Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2152

5> Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. in regards to limitation (c), claim language recites transmitting "information" to the TV. However, there are two types of information referenced in the claim: "for use of information" in (a) and "additional information" in (b). The use of "information" in limitation (c) should be clarified to refer to either of these uses.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6> Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted Prior Art ("AAPA", hereafter), in view of Nobakht (US 6,785,716), in further view of Barton et al, U.S Patent Publication No. 2003|0095791 ["Barton"].

7> Regarding claim 1, 16 and 24, AAPA discloses the invention substantially, as claimed, including, *a method for accessing the Internet using an Internet TV in an Internet TV system comprising the internet TV, in which a function of accessing the Internet and a function of receiving a TV broadcast are combined and a server for operating a portal site, which provides information to the*

Art Unit: 2152

Internet TV, the method comprising: transmitting a message from the Internet TV to the sever requesting authentication during a current session (AAPA, 210, Fig. 1-2). AAPA is silent on steps of improving authentication process, which, however, are taught by Nobakht as follow:

transmitting a message from the server requesting an authentication number from he Internet TV (Nobakht, 720, Fig. 7).

transmitting the requested authentication number from the Internet TV to the server (715, Fig. 7) and if the authorization number is available, checking a validity of the transmitted authentication number (Nobakht, 730, Fig. 7), and providing information to the Internet TV for the current session if it is determined that the authorization is valid (Nobakht, 735-750, Fig. 7); and

requesting a new authentication number from the server if the authentication number is not available (Nobakht teaches, if a request is not from residential, then the request in considered invalid and issued a guest access authorization code, Col.13, lines 20-29), registering a user in accordance with information collected by the server (Nobakht teaches server update user and terminal information, Col.II, lines 22-41), receiving a new authentication number from the server and providing information to the Internet (Nobakht, Col.13, lines 20-36).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to adapt and incorporate the detail steps as Nobakht's suggestion for improving authentication process in a prior art Internet TV system with the motivation of enhancing system's capability of accessing re-authorization, unauthorized-access notification. Such improvement would make attractive products

Art Unit: 2152

that could be easily marketed, because the added features would enable service providers to communicate and motivate their subscribers to retain their subscription, which translated to maintaining revenue and profit margins to the providers.

AAPA and Nobakht, however, fail to expressly disclose that the new authentication number is stored for use during a later session.

8> Applicant's amendments propose storing an authentication number at the internet TV such that the user would not need to log on again in a later session. In essence, this is merely describing a "cookie", a well-known tool in the networking arts for storing a variety of information at a user's computer. The amendment does not provide any patentable distinction over what is well known in the art.

Further, Barton discloses first checking if an authorization number is available at a user's internet TV [0050 where : Barton discloses looking for a stored cookie with the user's authorization key], if the authorization number is not available, submitting a new authorization number to the user [0047], and storing the new authorization number in a memory device of the internet TV for use during a later session [0047, 0050 : storing the authorization information as a cookie at the user computer]. Use of a cookie is well known in the art for streamlining a user's experience because necessary information is already stored on the user computer, in the form of a cookie. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify AAPA and Nobakht with Barton's cookie functionality such that user information is stored at the user computer once and registration steps may be skipped in later sessions [Barton, 0050].

9> Regarding claims 2, 7, 16 and 17, are analog to claim 1, therefore rejected by the same rationale.

Further, in regards to claims 2 and 7, AAPA-Nobakht do not expressly disclose determining an authentication based on additional information collected by the portal server. However, Barton discloses determining authorization information based on an ID of the user's computer [0069 : determining key based on serial number collected from the computer]. It would have been obvious to incorporate Barton's security functionality into AAPA-Nobakht's invention to provide a more secure system for users to access online information.

10> Regarding claims 3, 8 and 20, AAPA-Nobakht discloses capability of determining state client's device, e.g., *default state*, compare authentication code, allowing a user to input information regarding to authorization code, receiving and storing user information, as discussed in ¶ above.

11> Regarding claims 4-6, 9, 10, 21 and 23, AAPA-Nobakht discloses the invention substantially, as claimed, as described in claim 2, including, providing guest access code, if the user is not residential, which inherent a process of making determination the connected client has a proper information, e.g., number or the like, for authentication purpose. Thus, this teaching has functionality equivalent to *determining whether an authentication number is not available*. AAPA-Nobakht also requires user(s) to enter authentication number, which

Art Unit: 2152

includes serial number of the set-top box, manufacturer date, in order to the server issuing access code to the users, i.e., *requesting the portal server to provide a new authentication number with respect to the use of information; and receiving a new authentication number from the portal server and storing the authentication number in a memory device* (Nobakht, Col.12, line 43-Col. 13, line 29).

12> Regarding claims 11, 12 and 18, AAPA-Nobakht discloses the method of claim 1, including *accessing user information in a database if an error is not detected in the authentication number; and providing information to the Internet TV regarding user fees if the user information indicates that a user is registered*. AAPA-Nobakht is silent on perform error checking by using checksum concept. Official Notice is taken (see MPEP 2144.03) a notion of using checksum for checking integrity of messages that were transmitted across a network was notorious at the time of the invention was made. The well-known notion has been widely used to ensure reliability and integrity of the transmitted data. The evident of this assertion could be found in many engineering texts (not provided). Thus, regardless of messages' type, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to be motivated and taken advantage from the benefit as stated above by employing the known checksum concept for checking or detecting messages condition, including checking error of an authentication number.

13> Regarding claims 13 and 19, AAPA-Nobakht discloses the invention substantially as discussed above, including *transmitting an error message when an error is detected in the*

authentication number; requesting the internet TV to provide user information, and determining whether the user is registered in the database; and transmuting a corresponding authentication number when it is determined that the user is registered in the database (Nobakht, Col.12, lines 60-66).

AAPA-Nobakht however, does not explicitly apply its' event notification delivery mechanisms to deliver the error, which is discovered by checksum notion. In other words, the sources of error are different. However, applying steps or mechanisms that is capable of delivering event notification for notifying an error event, which is generated from different sources, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that was a matter of choice that depends on the situation and application does not involve inventive steps nor produce any unexpected result.

14> Regarding claims 14, AAPA-Nobakht discloses *registering the user in the database and providing information to the Internet TV when the user information is received,*(Nobakht, Col.11, lines 23-41).

15> Regarding claims 15, AAPA-Nobakht discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising *determining whether a user fee is paid; and transmuting a message to the Internet T'V informing that the user fee is not paid,* (Nobakht, Col.12, lines 59-66)

16> Regarding claims 22, AAPA-Nobakht discloses *registering a user in accordance with a user registration form requested by the portal server* (Nobakht, Col.11, lines 24-41).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is 571.272.3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday [7:00 AM to 5:00 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER